

2016 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD
Southern University and A&M College
 Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & Southern University System
Public University Alternate Teacher Preparation Program

BASIC PROGRAM INFORMATION

Program Web Site	http://www.subr.edu/index.cfm/page/229		
Approval/Accreditation	Names of Agencies		Status
	State: Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE)		Approved
	State: Board of Regents (BoR)		Approved
	Regional: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)		Accredited
National: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE); Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC); or Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)		Accredited	
Type of Program	Alternate (Certification-Only & Master of Arts in Teaching)		

CANDIDATE SELECTION PROFILE

Academic Strength	Completer Passage Rate on Praxis Skills Assessment (2013-14)		100%				
	Median GPA of Candidates Entering the Program (2013-14)		2.60				
	Median GPA of Candidates Completing the Program (2013-14)		3.20				
	Number of Candidates who Started but Did not Complete the Program Within 6 Years		Data Not Yet Available				
Teaching Promise	Data not yet available.						
Candidates/Completer Diversity	Candidates (2013-14)	Enrolled	Completers	Total			
		30	16	46			
	Enrolled Gender	Males		Females			
		8		22			
Enrolled Race	Hispanic	Indian	Asian	Black	Islander	White	Multi-Racial
	0	0	0	30	0	0	0

KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS FOR TEACHING OF COMPLETERS

Knowledge	Content	Completer Passage Rate on Praxis Content Assessments (2013-14)	100%	
	Pedagogical	Completer Passage Rate on Praxis Professional Knowledge Assessments (2013-14)	100%	
	Overall	Completer Passage Rate on all Assessments (2013-14)	100%	
Clinical Experiences	Full Time Internships are Offered as an Option for the Academic Year		Yes	
	Student Teaching	Clock Hours of Clinical Experiences Prior to Student Teaching		180
		Clock Hours of Clinical Experiences During Student Teaching	Number of Weeks	Number of Clock Hours per Week
		14	35	490
Licensure Requirements	Number and Percentage of 2013-14 Completers That Meet State Licensing Requirements		100%	
Completer Rating	Data Not Yet Available			

PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY AND ALIGNMENT TO STATE NEEDS OF COMPLETERS

Entry and Persistence in Teaching in Public Schools in Louisiana <i>(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)</i>	Percentage & Number of 2013-14 Completers That Were Teaching in 2014-15		81% (n=13)		
	Percentage & Number of 2013-14 Completers That Obtained a License to Teach		Data Not Yet Available		
	2009-10 Completers Teaching in Public Schools in Louisiana in 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-15				
	Number of 2009-10 Completers	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2010-11	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2011-12	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2012-13	Number & Percentage Teaching in 2013-14
100% (n=84)	92% (n=77)	86% (n=72)	85% (n=71)	85% (n=71)	86% (n=72)
Placement/Persistence in High-Need Subjects/Schools	Data Not Yet available				

2016 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD (CONT'D)

Southern University and A&M College

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents & Southern University System

Certification-Only Alternate Teacher Preparation Program

PERFORMANCE AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS (NEW TEACHERS WITH LESS THAN TWO YEARS OF TEACHING)

<p>Impact on K-12 Students</p> <p><i>(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)</i></p>	<p>Mean <i>Compass Student Growth Score</i> (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-15) and Number of Scores for All New Teachers with Less than Two Years of Teaching</p>	<p align="center">Compass Student Growth Mean & Number of Scores</p>			
		<p align="center">3.2 (n=129)</p>			
	<p>Percentage and Number of 2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 <i>Compass Student Growth Scores</i> for the New Teachers by LDOE Teacher Effectiveness Levels</p>	<p align="center">Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Student Outcome Growth</p>			
		<p align="center">Ineffective</p> <p align="center">4%</p>	<p align="center">Effective Emerging</p> <p align="center">11%</p>	<p align="center">Effective Proficient</p> <p align="center">36%</p>	<p align="center">Highly Effective</p> <p align="center">50%</p>
<p>Demonstrated Teaching Skill</p> <p><i>(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)</i></p>	<p>Mean <i>Compass Professional Practice Score</i> (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-15) and Number of Scores for All New Teachers with Less than Two Years of Teaching</p>	<p align="center">Compass Professional Practice Mean & Number of Scores</p>			
		<p align="center">3.0 (n=129)</p>			
	<p>Percentage and Number of 2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 <i>Compass Professional Practice Scores</i> for the New Teachers by LDOE Teacher Effectiveness Levels</p>	<p align="center">Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Professional Practice Scores</p>			
		<p align="center">Ineffective</p> <p align="center">0%</p>	<p align="center">Effective Emerging</p> <p align="center">15%</p>	<p align="center">Effective Proficient</p> <p align="center">70%</p>	<p align="center">Highly Effective</p> <p align="center">16%</p>
<p>Overall Impact and Demonstrated Teaching Skill</p> <p><i>(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)</i></p>	<p>Mean <i>Compass Final Evaluation Score</i> (2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-15) and Number of Scores for New Teachers with Less than Two Years of Teaching</p>	<p align="center">Compass Final Evaluation Mean & Number of Scores</p>			
		<p align="center">3.1 (n=129)</p>			
	<p>Percentage and Number of 2012-13, 2013-14, & 2014-15 <i>Compass Final Evaluation Scores</i> for the New Teachers by LDOE Teacher Effectiveness Levels</p>	<p align="center">Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels for Final Evaluation Scores</p>			
		<p align="center">Ineffective</p> <p align="center">4%</p>	<p align="center">Effective Emerging</p> <p align="center">7%</p>	<p align="center">Effective Proficient</p> <p align="center">65%</p>	<p align="center">Highly Effective</p> <p align="center">24%</p>
<p>State Value Added Scores for Growth in Student Learning for New Teachers in Grades 4-8 with Less than Two Years of Teaching by Content Areas (Twenty-five or More New Teachers)</p> <p><i>(Please examine the 2016 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Fact Book to accurately interpret the meaning of these scores.)</i></p>	<p>Content Areas</p>	<p align="center">Mean, Number of Scores, & Effectiveness Levels for Value-Added Scores of Twenty-five or More New Teachers with Less Than Two Years of Teaching who Taught During 2014-15 (3- to 5-Year Averages)</p>			
	<p>Mathematics</p> <p><i>(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)</i></p>	<p align="center">N/A (n=30)</p>			
		<p align="center">Ineffective</p> <p align="center">10%</p>	<p align="center">Effective Emerging</p> <p align="center">40%</p>	<p align="center">Effective Proficient</p> <p align="center">20%</p>	<p align="center">Highly Effective</p> <p align="center">30%</p>
	<p>Science</p>	<p align="center">N/A (n=N/A)</p>			
		<p align="center">Ineffective</p> <p align="center">N/A%</p>	<p align="center">Effective Emerging</p> <p align="center">N/A%</p>	<p align="center">Effective Proficient</p> <p align="center">N/A%</p>	<p align="center">Highly Effective</p> <p align="center">N/A%</p>
	<p>Social Studies</p>	<p align="center">3.8 (n=27)</p>			
		<p align="center">Ineffective</p> <p align="center">4%</p>	<p align="center">Effective Emerging</p> <p align="center">26%</p>	<p align="center">Effective Proficient</p> <p align="center">30%</p>	<p align="center">Highly Effective</p> <p align="center">41%</p>
	<p>English/Language Arts/Reading</p> <p><i>(Note: A Mean score could not be determined this year to calculate 3- to 5-year averages due to differences in cut-off scores for new assessments. Percentages of individual scores within effectiveness levels could be determined.)</i></p>	<p align="center">N/A (n=25)</p>			
		<p align="center">Ineffective</p> <p align="center">4%</p>	<p align="center">Effective Emerging</p> <p align="center">44%</p>	<p align="center">Effective Proficient</p> <p align="center">32%</p>	<p align="center">Highly Effective</p> <p align="center">20%</p>